



*Zhu*  
*AF*

Docket No.: HI-0179

PATENT

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of

**EXPEDITED PROCEDURE  
UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116**

Byung Soo SONG et al.

Confirmation No.: 9020

Serial No.: 10/671,657

Group Art Unit: 2628

Filed: 9/29/2003

Examiner: Manucher RAHMJOO

**Customer No.: 34610**

For: DRIVING METHOD AND APPARATUS OF PLASMA DISPLAY PANEL

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
Customer Service Window, **Mail Stop AF**  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Sir:

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection set forth in the Office Action dated March 19, 2007. Claims 4-5, 9-11, 28 and 31-34 are pending in this application.

The Office Action rejects claims 4-5, 9-11, 28 and 31-34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 6,496,194 to Mikoshiba et al. (hereafter Mikoshiba) in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2001-083926 to Okomoto et al. (hereafter Okomoto). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 4 recites detecting false contour generation regions from each of first video data for a previous frame period and second video data for a current frame period. See also independent claim 28. The Office Action (on pages 2 and 5-6) asserts that Mikoshiba's

Abstract, Figs. 15 to 18B and col. 15, lines 60-67 teaches detecting each false contour generation region. However, Mikoshiba's Figs. 15 to 18B discloses superimposing an equalizing pulse EPA on a source signal of each of the pixels G, H and I that may cause problems such as a dark emitting part DP due to a gray level change from 127 to 128. See Mikoshiba's col. 13, line 36-col. 15, line 19.

Mikoshiba does not teach or suggest detecting false contour generation regions from each of first video data and second video data, as recited in independent claims 4 and 28. For example, false contour generation pixels and false contour generation regions are different. That is, false contour generation regions include a pixel corresponding to a gray scale generating the false contour and pixels corresponding to adjacent gray scales to the gray scale. See, for example, paragraph [0065] of the present specification. In other words, even though Mikoshiba discloses superimposing an equalizing pulse on a source signal of each of pixels that may cause problems, Mikoshiba does not teach or suggest detecting false contour generation regions from each of first video data for a previous frame period and a second video data for a current frame period.

In summary, Mikoshiba does not discuss detecting false contour generation regions from each of first video data for a previous frame period and second video data for a current frame period, as recited in independent claims 4 and 28. Okomoto does not teach or suggest these missing features.

Independent claim 4 also recites extracting a motion information from the detected false contour generation regions of the first video data and the second video data. See also

independent claim 28 reciting determining motion information from the false contour generation regions of the first video data and the second video data.

The Office Action (on pages 3 and 6-7) states that the comparing and outputting steps of Mikoshiba's col. 12, lines 45-55 and Fig. 14 corresponds to the claimed extracting motion information. However, Mikoshiba discloses comparing two successive frames and outputting +1,-1 or 0 for a pixel depending on whether the bit data was changed. In other words, Mikoshiba only discloses detecting changes in bit data on a pixel-by-pixel basis. Mikoshiba does not mention detected false contour generation regions or extracting a motion information. Thus, Mikoshiba does not teach or suggest extracting a motion information from the detected false contour generation regions as recited in independent claim 4 or determining motion information from the detected false contour generation regions as recited in independent claim 28. Okomoto does not teach or suggest these missing features.

Independent claim 4 further recites setting a compensation value based on a velocity value and a size of the gray scale from the motion information. The Office Action (on page 3) cites Mikoshiba's col. 16, lines 50-55 and col. 36, lines 45-50 for these features. However, Mikoshiba's col. 16, lines 50-55 only discloses that when a gray scale change is smooth, correct motion compensation is possible; however, in the case of a fine pattern, inability to reduce disturbances sufficiently may result. This does not teach or suggest setting a compensation value based on a velocity value from the motion information.

Also, Mikoshiba's col. 36, lines 45-50 only discloses that a halftone display method (of Mikoshiba) can alleviate a problem of moving-image false contours in video for moving images moving at various speeds and in various directions. Alleviating the problem of moving-image false contours in video for moving images moving at various speeds and in various directions does not suggest adaptively setting a compensation value based on the velocity value according to the image moving velocity. In summary, Mikoshiba does not teach or suggest setting a compensation value based on the velocity value from the motion information.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Mikoshiba does not teach or suggest all the features of independent claims 4 and 28 (as alleged in the Office Action). Okomoto does not teach or suggest the features of independent claims 4 and 28 missing from Mikoshiba. Thus, each of independent claims 4 and 28 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.


In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 4-5, 9-11, 28 and 31-34 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Serial No. 10/671,657  
Reply to Office Action dated March 19, 2007

Docket No. HI-0179

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



David C. Oren  
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
(703) 766-3777 DCO/kah

**Date: June 19, 2007**

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**